UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,104	06/04/2001	Robert E. Haines	10003219-1	6048

7590 07/21/2009

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2444	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/874,104	HAINES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KRISTIE D. SHINGLES	2444	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 April 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5,6,8-11,15 and 17-23* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5,6,8-11,15 and 17-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendments
Claims 6 and 22 have been amended.
Claims 2, 4, 7, 12-14 and 16 have been canceled.

<u>Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-11, 15 and 17-23 are pending.</u>

Response to Arguments

I.   Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 6 and 22 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

II.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/3/2009 regarding independent claims 1, 15, 21 and 23 have

been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner's arguments follow.

   A.   With respect to claim 1, Applicant argues that the *Combar et al* reference has "no
   disclosure that the client transmits the cookie to any remote computer, where the
   remote computer is a different element from the web server as in claim 1".

   Examiner respectfully disagrees. As identified in the previous rejection *Sears, Jr.*

et al teach the claim limitation that a web client requests and receives a first cookie from a

remote computer (i.e., a cookie server) and subsequently transmits both the first cookie and a

request for the resource to a web server (*Figure 3, col.2 lines 45-51, col.9 line 28-col.10 line 2*).

However as stated in the rejection, *Sears Jr. et al* fail to explicitly teach the claimed limitation of

"the Web client receiving input from a user defining the URL; wherein the first request

transmitting step is automatically performed in response to receiving the user input; the WEB

client receiving the resource and a second cookie from the WEB server; and in response to

receiving the second cookie, the WEB client transmitting the second cookie to the remote

computer for storage". Nonetheless, *Combar et al* teach a user's web-enabled client device receiving a URL request input from the user, and the user's web-enabled client device receiving the resource and a cookie for each HTTPS request from the web/dispatch server, and subsequently sending the cookie to a separate cookie jar server for storage (*Figure 2, col.7 lines 27-41*). The illustration in Figure 2, makes it apparent that the web/dispatch server and the cookie jar server are separate devices, wherein the separate cookie jar server is used to offload the duties of the web/dispatch server.

B.   With respect to claim 1, Applicant argues that the motivation for combining the *Sears, Jr. et al* reference with the *Combar et al* reference has is lacking and was made in hindsight of Applicant's disclosure.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The motivation stated "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Combar et al* for transmitting a cookie with the request for a web resource and storing the cookie in a remote storage, in order to customize the requested web document accordingly with the user's information and maintain the user's cookie data in a separate location for added security and extended accessibility". This rationale can be found in *Combar et al's* disclosure which teaches using a separate cookie jar server for "adding an additional level of security" (*col.7 lines 40-41*). Cookie jar servers are commonly used in the art for storing client cookies in safe, external storage separate from the client's device. Applicant's arguments are therefore unpersuasive and the rejection of claim 1 is maintained.

C.   With respect to claim 15, Applicant argues that the *Quatrano et al* reference fails to teach that "participants...receive a cookie...from [a] web server and then automatically transmit that cookie to [an] application server".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Figure 4 clearly illustrates the cited teachings of

Quatrano et al, wherein a participant makes an HTTP request from the participants browser, and

a shared session is initiated wherein a cookie is generated by an application server and sent with

the resource to the participant. However, as stated in the previous rejection *Quatrano et al* does

not teach the participant send the cookie to a remote server for storage, hence, the rejection was

made in view of *Combar et al* who satisfies this limitation as stated above. *Combar et al* teach a

user's web-enabled client device receiving a URL request input from the user, and the user's

web-enabled client device receiving the resource and a cookie for each HTTPS request from the

web/dispatch server, and subsequently sending the cookie to a separate cookie jar server for

storage (*Figure 2, col.7 lines 27-41*). The illustration in Figure 2, makes it apparent that the

web/dispatch server and the cookie jar server are separate devices, wherein the separate cookie

jar server is used to offload the duties of the web/dispatch server. Applicant's arguments are

therefore unpersuasive and the rejection for claim 15 is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

III.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

IV.   <u>**Claims 1, 3, 5 and 21**</u> **are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**
       ***Sears, Jr. et al* (US 6,934,736) in view of *Combar et al* (US 7,058,600).**

    a.   **Regarding claim 1**, *Sears, Jr. et al* teach a method of requesting a resource

having a URL from a WEB server, comprising:

- a Web client transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL (*Abstract, Figures 3 and 4, col.9 lines 4-11, col.11 lines 61-63—client request cookie associated with a selected website from the cookie server*); then

- a Web client receiving a first cookie from the remote computer (*col.2 lines 45-49, col.9 line 28-col.10 line 2—the client receives a cookie from the cookie server*); and

- a Web client transmitting both the first cookie and a request for the resource to the WEB Server (*Figure 3, col.2 lines 49-51—client then connects to the website and provides the cookie to the website*).

    Sears, Jr. et al's teaching of connecting to the desired website and providing the

cookie to the website implies that the website request and the cookie are both sent to a web

server in order to access a customized resource from the website (*col.11 lines 56-60*). However,

Sears, Jr. et al fail to explicitly teach the Web client receiving input from a user defining the

URL; wherein the first request transmitting step is automatically performed in response to

receiving the user input; the WEB client receiving the resource and a second cookie from the

WEB server; and in response to receiving the second cookie, the WEB client transmitting the

second cookie to the remote computer for storage. Nonetheless, *Combar et al* explicitly teach

that the client includes the cookie in the request for content to the server and transmitting the

newly generated, unique cookie to a web server, dispatch server or separate cookie jar server for

storage (*col.7 lines 27-41*).

    It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Combar et al* for

transmitting a cookie with the request for a web resource and storing the cookie in a remote

storage, in order to customize the requested web document accordingly with the user's

information and maintain the user's cookie data in a separate location for added security and

extended accessibility.

      b.   **Claim 21** contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and is

therefore rejected under the same basis.

      c.   **Regarding claim 3**, *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Combar et al* teach the method of claim

2, *Sears, Jr. et al* further teach wherein the first request transmitting step is performed by

transmitting the first request over a network to the remote computer (*col.9 lines 4-11, col.11 lines*

61-63; Combar et al—col.7 lines 27-41).

      d.   **Regarding claim 5,** *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Combar et al* teach the method of claim

3, *Sears, Jr. et al* further teach wherein the network comprises the INTERNET (*col.5 lines 23-*

25; Combar et al—col.10 lines 31-42).

V.   **Claims 15, 17 and 23** **are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**
         ***Quatrano et al* (US 6,748,420) in view of *Combar et al* (US 7,058,600).**

      a.   **Per claim 15,** *Quatrano et al* teach a system comprising:

- a first WEB client (*col.5 lines 3-8*);

- a second WEB client (*col.5 lines 3-8*);

- a computer remote from the first WEB client and the second WEB client ();
- wherein the first WEB client is operable to: receive a first resource and a first
  cookie from a first WEB Server and configured to automatically respond thereto
  by processing the first resource and transmitting the first cookie to a remote
  computer (*col.7 lines 7-35*); and receive a URL from a user and is responsive
  thereto by first transmitting a request to the remote computer for a cookie that is
  valid for the URL (*col.14 lines 19-55*); and

- wherein the second WEB client is operable to receive a second resource and a
  second cookie from a second WEB server and configured to automatically

respond thereto by processing the second resource and transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer (*col.7 lines 36-60, col.9 lines 1-28, col.15 lines 27-42*); and

- wherein the remote computer is operable to receive the request from the first WEB client and is responsive thereto by: (a) transmitting the stored first cookie to the first WEB client if the stored first cookie is valid for the URL; and (b) transmitting the stored second cookie to the first WEB client if the stored second cookie is valid for the URL (*col.23 line 27-col.24 line 30—transmitting the cookie with the HTTP URL request and for each user if the cookie is valid for the requested web page*).

Quatrano et al fail to explicitly teach wherein the remote computer is operable to receive the first cookie from the first WEB client and to then store the first cookie; and wherein the remote computer is operable to receive the second cookie from the second WEB client and to then store the second cookie; and. Nonetheless, *Combar et al* teach that the client includes the cookie in the request for content to the server and transmitting the newly generated, unique cookie to a web server, dispatch server or separate cookie jar server for storage (*col.7 lines 27-41*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Quatrano et al* with *Combar et al* for transmitting a cookie with the request for a web resource to multiple users and storing the cookie in a remote storage, in order to customize the requested web document accordingly with the user's information and maintain the user's cookie data in a separate location for added security and extended accessibility.

b.   **Claim 23** contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 15 and is

therefore rejected under the same basis.

c.   **Regarding claim 17**, *Quatrano et al* with *Combar et al* teach the system of claim

15, *Quatrano et al* further teach the system further comprising a monitoring device operable to

monitor a first device to detect when the device generates a pre-defined signal and to respond

thereto by generating a notification that the signal was generated; and wherein the first WEB

client and the second WEB client are operable by a user to retrieve the notification (*col.25 lines*

32-57, col.26 line 45-col.27 line 21, col.28 lines 3-28).

**VI.   Claims 6, 8-11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over *Dutta* (US 6,539,424) in view of *Quatrano et al* (US 6,748,420).**

a.   **Regarding claim 6**, *Dutta* teaches a computing device, comprising:

- means for receiving, at the computing device, from a first web client, a first
  cookie that is valid for a first range of URLs, the first cookie provided to the first
  web client by a web server (*col.4 lines 29-56—server-side cookie storage
  receives cookie from client wherein the cookie was provided to the client by a
  content producer web server*);

- means for receiving, at the computing device a first request for a cookie that is
  valid for a first URL (*col.5 lines 56-66—client request cookie associated with a
  selected URL from the server-side cookie storage*);

- and means for responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie from
  the computing device (*col.5 line 55-col.6 line 16—server-side cookie storage
  provides the cookie to the client*).

Yet *Dutta* fails to explicitly teach receiving a first request for a cookie from a

second WEB client different from the first WEB client, and transmitting the first cookie to the

second WEB client if the first URL is within the first range of URLs, the second web client

adapted to transmit the first cookie to the web server, wherein the computing device is different

from the first and second web clients and the web server. However *Quatrano et al* teach the sharing of cookies among a group of web clients, wherein a cookie transmitted to a first user may also be sent to a second user upon request for the URL (*col.7 lines 26-col.8 line 52, col.9 lines 16-43, col.15 lines 27-42, col.16 lines 1-7, col.21 lines 45-57, col.22 lines 45-54, col.23 lines 41-60, col.24 lines 41-55*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Dutta* with *Quatrano et al* in order to provide shared access of a website to multiple users, by permitting the sharing of cookies from one client to another without compromising the privacy of each client's information.

b.   **Claims 9, 10 and 22** contain limitations are substantially equivalent to claim 6 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c.   **Regarding claim 8**, *Dutta* with *Quatrano et al* teach the computing device of claim 6, *Dutta* further teaches wherein the first cookie receiving means is configured to receive the first cookie from the first WEB client over a network; and wherein the first request responding means is configured to transmit the first cookie to the send WEB client over the network (*col.4 lines 29-56, col.5 lines 55-66; Quatrano et al—col.16 lines 1-7, col.21 lines 45-57, col.22 lines 45-54, col.23 lines 41-60, col.24 lines 41-55*).

d.   **Regarding claim 11**, *Dutta* with *Quatrano et al* teach the computing device of claim 10, *Dutta* further teaches wherein the network comprises the INTERNET (*col.3 line 66-col.4 line 66; Quatrano et al—col.12 lines 56-60*).

VII.   Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Quatrano et al* (US 6,748,420) in view of *Combar et al* (US 7,058,600) and further in view of *Silverbrook et al* (US 6,813,039).

a.   **Regarding claim 18**, *Quatrano et al* with *Combar et al* teach the system of claim 17, as applied above, yet fail to teach a printer. However, *Silverbrook et al* teach a printer wherein the sensing device that monitors the status of the printer (*Abstract, col.24 lines 6-8*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Quatrano et al* and *Combar et al* with *Silverbrook et al* by having a monitoring device for a printer; because this allows the users to monitor the printer's status to determine when maintenance is required.

b.   **Regarding claim 19**, *Quatrano et al* and *Combar et al* with *Silverbrook et al* teach the system of 18, *Silverbrook et al* further teach the system comprising: the printer; and wherein the printer includes a replaceable consumable cartridge; and wherein the printer is

operable to generate the signal when a consumable in the cartridge moves below a pre-determined level (*col.23 line 50*).

      c.   **Regarding claim 20**, *Quatrano et al* and *Combar et al* with *Silverbrook et al* teach the system of claim 19, *Silverbrook et al* further teach wherein the printer is a laser printer (*col.15 lines 30-32*).

Conclusion

VIII.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure: Montulli (5826242), Dinovo (7139814), Gupta et al (6226752).

IX.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

      A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

X.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KRISTIE D. SHINGLES whose telephone number is (571)272-

3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday 9:00am-6:30pmpm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie D. Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2444

/KDS/
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444